

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION N	
10/743,457	12/23/2003	Akitoshi Nakajima	90606.3	90606.3 8150	
54071	7590 09/29/2006		EXAMINER		
YAMAHA HATSUDOKI KABUSHIKI KAISHA			KIM, CHONG HWA		
C/O KEATIN	G & BENNETT, LLP				
8180 GREEN:	SBORO DRIVE		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 850			3682		
MCIEAN V	A 22102				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Appli	cation No.	Applicant(s)				
		13,457	NAKAJIMA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Exam	iner	Art Unit				
		g H. Kim	3682				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisio after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this cor  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for rep  Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF ns of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In a nmunication. statutory period will apply a ly will, by statute, cause the	F THIS COMMUNICATION TO event, however, may a reply be tin and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from The application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co				
Status							
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) find the second secon</li></ol>	2b)⊠ This action n for allowance exc	is non-final. cept for formal matters, pro		e merits is			
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restr	are withdrawn from						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the specification is objected to by the specific to the	e: a) accepted of	(s) be held in abeyance. Sec quired if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/3/04; 6/14/06.	PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/743,457

Art Unit: 3682

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

Claims 1-22 use the language "type". The MPEP 2173.05(b) states that the addition of the word "type" to an otherwise definite expression extends the scope of the expression so as to render it indefinite. Ex parte Copenhaver, 109 USPQ 118 (Bd. App. 1955). See also claim 12.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "a large end portion" in line 2. However, the claim also recites "a large end portion" in line 6. It is indefinite because it is not clear whether the second occurrence of the large end portion is the same end portion of the first.

Claim 6 recites the limitations wherein there are a plurality of the first locking grooves and a plurality of the second locking grooves. However, there is only one of each grooves recites in claim 1 in which claim 6 is depended therefrom. Therefore, it is indefinite for failing to clearly point out exactly how many grooves are being claimed.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/743,457

Art Unit: 3682

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Page 3

4. Claims 1-16, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishida et al., U.S. Patent 6,312,159 B1.

Ishida et al. shows, in Figs. 1-11, a split type connecting rod that holds a crank-pin through a bearing 10 having a first protrusion 11 and second protrusion 12, comprising: a first locking groove 5a, 17a (Fig. 7) that locks the first protrusion of the bearing when the bearing rotates forward in a circumferential direction of a crank-pin hole; a second locking groove 5b, 17b (Fig. 7) that locks the second protrusion of the bearing when the bearing rotates backward in the circumferential direction of the crank-pin hole; wherein the first locking groove and the second locking groove are deviated from each other in the circumferential direction; further comprising a large end portion 1a including rod portion 2 and a cap portion 3, wherein the first locking groove and the second locking groove are arranged to extend over both of the rod portion and the cap portion (see Fig. 7) when the large end portion is fractured and split into the rod portion and the cap portion, the first locking groove is deviated to the rod portion side and the second locking groove is deviated to the cap portion side; wherein when the bearing is split, the first protrusion locked by the first locking groove and the second protrusion locked by the second locking groove are arranged separately on separate portions of the bearing that has been split; wherein the bearing is substantially ring-shaped and disposed on an inner circumferential surface of the crank-pin hole; wherein the bearing includes a rod portion 22 and a cap portion 23 which are divided along a splitting line C of the bearing; wherein at least two of the first locking grooves are provided on a first side of the splitting line and at least two of the second locking

grooves are provided on a second side of the splitting line; wherein the first and second locking grooves are substantially arc-shaped; wherein the first and second protrusion are locking lugs; wherein the first and second locking grooves are arranged to prevent the bearing from moving in the circumferential direction; wherein a valley 21 is formed on the inner circumferential surface of the crank-pin hole, the valley includes a base portion, and a fracture starting point groove formed at the base portion of the valley; wherein a width of the fracture starting point groove is less than a width of the valley; wherein the split type connecting rod is a nut-less type of connecting rod that is made of one of forged material, a cast material, and a sintered material; wherein the valley includes a pair of sloped portions; wherein the sloped portions define chamfers 17a, 17b for guiding the bearing; wherein the connecting rod is used in an engine of a vehicle.

Page 4

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida et al. in view of Mukai et al., U.S. Patent 4,693,139.

Ishida et al. shows, as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 15, the split type connecting rod comprising the valley with the fracture starting point portions, but fails to

Application/Control Number: 10/743,457 Page 5

Art Unit: 3682

show sloped portions having either curved shapes, swelled rounded shapes, or a concave or a

rectilinear shape in an upper corner of the valley.

Makai et al. shows, in Figs. 5 and 6, the split type connecting rod comprising a valley

having fracture starting point grooves and sloped portions 11 and 12 with rectilinear shapes 11

and 12.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the shape of the sloped portion of Ishida et al. with the rectilinear

shapes as taught by Makai et al. in order to prevent breaking and dividing along the rectilinear

shaped portion of the connecting rod as described from col. 3, line 48 to col. 4, line 3.

As to the matter of the other different shapes, it would have been obvious to modify the

rectilinear shape as taught by Makei et al. with either curved shapes, swelled rounded shapes, or

concave shapes, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of

the sloped portion. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of

ordinary skill in the art. In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPO 47 (CCPA 1966)

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Bearing with limiting grooves.

Kazama, U.S. Patent 4,014,596

Reddy, U.S. Patent 3,679,244

Application/Control Number: 10/743,457 Page 6

Art Unit: 3682

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chong H. Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-7108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 6:00 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Ridley can be reached on (571) 272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

chk

September 25, 2006

CHONG H. KIM

PRIMARY EXAMINER